THE MOORISH WAR.

As the first, and possibly at the same time the last act of the Spanish war in Morocco has now been brought to a close, and as all the detailed official reports have arrived, we may once more return

to the subject. On the first of January the Spanish army left the lines of Ceuta, in order to advanceupon Tetuan, which is only 21 miles distant. Though never at any time seriously attacked, or stopped by the enemy, it took Marshal O'Donnell not less then a month to bring his troops to within sight of that town. The absence of roads, and the necessary caution are not sufficient motives for this un paralleled slowness of march; and it is plain that the command of the sea possessed by the Spaniards, was not utilized to the full extest. Nor is it an excuse that a road had to be made for heavy guns and provisions. Both should have been principally carried by the ships, while the army, provided with a week's provision, and no other guns than the mountain artillery (carried on the backs of mules) could have reached the hights above Tetuan in five days at the utmost, and waited with the Rios division, which then, as well as three weeks afterward, could not be prevested from landing at the mouth of the Wahad el Jelu. The battle of the 4th of February might have been fought, and probably under still more favorable aspects for the Spaniards, on the 6th or 7th of January: thus thousands of men lost through sickness would have been spared, and by the 8th of January Tetuan might have been

This seems a bold assertion. Surely, O'Donnell was as eager to get to Tetuan as any of his soldiers; he has shown bravery, circumspection, coolness. and other soldierly qualities. If it took him a month to arrive before it, how could be have done the same thing in a week O'Dennell had two ways before him to bring up his troops. First, he might rely chiefly or the communication by land, and use the ships merely as auxiliaries. This is what he did. He erganized a regular land transport for his provisions and ammunition, and took with the army a numerous field-artillery of 12-pounders. His army was to be entirely independent of the ships, in case of need; the ships were to serve merely as a second line of communication with Centa, useful, but anything but indispensable. This plan, of course, entailed the organization of an immense train of carriages, and this train necessitated the construction of a road. Thus a week was lost until the road from the lines to the beach had been constructed; and almost at every step. the whole column, army, train and all, was halted, until another piece of road had been made for the next day's advance. Thus, the duration of the march was measured by the miles of road which the Spanish engineers could construct from day to day; and this appears to have been done at the rate of about half a mile per day. Thus the very means selected to transport the provisions necessitated an immense increase of the train, for the longer the army remained on the road, the more, of course, it must consume. Still, when, about the 18th January, a gale drove the steamers from the coast, the army was starving, and that within sight of their depot at Ceuta: another stormy day, and one-third of the army would have had to march back to fetch provision for the other two. Thus it was that Marshal O'Donnell managed to promenade 18,000 Spaniards along the coast of Africa for a whole month at the rate of two-thirds of a mile a day. This system of provisioning the army once adopted, no power in the world could have very materially shortened the length of this unparalteled march; but was it not a mistake to adopt it at all ?

If Tetnan had been an inland town, situated twenty-one miles from the coast instead of four miles, no doubt there would have been no other choice. The French in those expeditions to the interior of Algeria found the same difficulties and in the same way, though w greater energy and quickness. The English in India and Afghanistan were saved this trouble by the comparative facility of finding beasts of burden and provender for them in those countries; their artillery was light, and required no good roads, as the campaigns were carried on in the dry season only, when armies can march straight across the country. But it was left to the Spaniards and to Marshal O'Donnell to march an army along the sea-shore for a whole month, and to accomplish in this time the immense distance of twenty-one

It is evident from this that both appliances and ideas in the Spanish army are of a very old-fashiened character. With a fleet of steamers and sailing transports always within sight, this march is perfectly ridiculous, and the men disabled during it by cholera and dysentery, were sacrificed to prejudice and incapacity. The road built by the engineers was no real communication with Ceuta, for it belonged to the Spaniards nowhere except where they happened to encamp. To the rear, the Moors might any day render it impracticable. To carry a message, or escort a convoy back to Centa, a division of 5,000 men at least was required. During the whole of the march, the communication with that place was carried on by the steamers alone. And with all that, the provisions accompanying the army were so insufficient that before twenty days had passed the army was on the point of starvation, and saved only by the stores from the fleet. Why, then, build the road at all, ? For the artillery? The Spaniards must have known for certain that the Moors had no fieldartillery, and that their own rifled mountain guns were superior to anything the enemy could bring against them. Why, then, trail all this artillery along with them, if the whole of it could be carried by sea from Ceuta to San Martin (at the mouth o the Wahad el Jelu or Tetuan river) in a couple o bours? For any extremity, a single battery o field-guns might have accompanied the army, and the Spanish artillery must be very clumsy, if they could not march it over any ground in the world at the rate of five miles a day.

The Spaniards had shipping to carry at least one division at a time, as the landing of the Rios division at San Martin proved. Had the attack been made by English or French troops, there is no doubt that this division would have been landed at once at San Martin, after a few demonstrations from Ceuta to attract the Moore to that place Such a division of 5,000 men, entrenched by slight field-works, such as might be thrown up in a single night, could have fearlessly awaited the attack of any number of Moors. But a division could have been landed every day, if the weather was favorable, and thus the army could have been concentrated within sight of Tetoan in six or eight days. We may, however, doubt whether O'Donnell would have liked to expose one of his divisions to an isolated attack for possibly three or four days-his

troops were young, and not senttomed to war. He cannot be blamed for rot having adopted this

But this he might and oubtedly have done. With every man carrying a week's provisions, with all his mountain guns-perhaps a battery of field guns, and as many stores as he could carry on the backs of his mules and horses, he might have marched off from Centa, and approached Tetuan as quickly as possible. Take all difficulties into consideration, eight miles a day is certainly little enough. But say five; this would give four days marching. Say two days for engagements, although they must be poor victories that do not imply a gain of five miles of ground. This would give six days in all, and would nclude all delays caused by the weather, for an army without a train can certainly do four or five miles a day in any weather almost. Thus the army would arrive in the plain of Tetuan before the provisions it carried were consumed; in case of need the steamers were there to land fresh supplies during the march, as they actually did. Morocco is no worse country for ground or weather than Algeria, and the French have done far more there in the midst of Winter, and far away in the hills, too, without any steamers to support and supply them. Once arrived on the heights of the Montes Negros, and master of the pass to Tetuan, the communication with the fleet in the roads of San Martin was safe. and the sea formed the base of operations. Thus, with a little boldness, the period during which the army had no base of operations but itself, would have been shortened from a month to a week, and the bolder plan was therefore the safer of the two; for the more formidable the Moors were, the more the slow march of O'Donnell became dangerous. And if the army had been defeated on the road to Tetuan, its retreat was far easier than if it had been encumbered with baggage and field artillery.

O'Donnell's progress from the Montes Negros, which he passed almost without opposition, was quite in keeping with his former slowness. There was again a throwing up and a strengthening of redoubts, as if the best organized army had been opposed to him. A week was thus wasted, although gainst such opponents, simple field-works would have sufficed; he couldnot expect to be attacked by any artillery equal to six of his mountain guns, and for the construction of such a camp one or two days ought to have been sufficient. At last, on the 4th, he attacked the intrenched camp of his opponents. The Spaniards appear to have behaved very well during this action; of the merits of the tactical arrangements we are unable to judge, the few correspondents in the Spanish camp dropping all the dry military details in favor of good painting and exaggerated exthusiasm. As the correspondent of The London Times says, what is the use of my describing to you a piece of ground which you ought to see, in order to judge of its nature! The Moors were completely routed, and the following day Tetuan surrendered.

This closes the first act of the campaign, and the Emperor of Morocco is not too obstinate, it will very likely close the whole war. Still, the difficulties incurred hitherto by the Spaniards-difficulties increased by the system on which they have conducted the war-show that if Morocco holds out, Spain will find it a very severe piece of work. It is not the actual resistance of the Moorish irregulars-that never will defeat disciplined troops s long as they hold together and can be fed; it is the uncultivated nature of the country, the impossibility of conquering anything but the towns, and to draw supplies even from them; it is the necessity of dispersing the army in a great many small posts, which after all, cannot suffice to keep open a regular communication between the conquered towns, and which cannot be victualed, unless the greater part of the force be sent to escort the convoys of stores over a roadless country, and across constantly reappearing clouds of Moorish skirmishers. It is well known what it was for the French, during the first five or six years of their African conquest, to revictual even Blidah and Medeah, not to speak of stations further from the coast. With the rapid wear and tear of European armies in that climate, six a country like Spain.

The first object of attack, if the warbe continued. will naturally be Tangier. The road from Tetuan to Tangier lies across a mountain pass, and then down the valley of a river. It is all inland workno steamers near to furnish stores, and no roads. The distance is about 26 miles. How long will it take Marshal O'Donnell to do this distance, and how many men will he have toleave in Tetuan? He is reported to have said that it will take 20,000 men to hold it: but this is evidently much exaggerated. With 10,000 men in the town, and a local brigade in an entrenched camp at San Martin, the place should be safe enough; such a force might always take the field in sufficient strength to disperse any Moorish attack. Tangier might be taken by bombardment from the sea, and the garrison brought thither by sea also. It would be the same with Larache, Sale, Mogador. But if the Spaniards intended to act in this way, why the long march to Tetuan? This much is certain: The Spaniards have much to learn yet in warfare before they can compel Morocco to peace, if Morocco holds out

GRECO-SLAVIC FEDERATION.

III. Federation alone remains as the normal, the easiest, and the most progressive and civilizing political form to be substituted for the Ottoman rule The countries now under Turkish rule are normal units. On the disappearance of Sultan, pashas, and cadis, they will spontaneously organize themselves by inborn, vital affinities, and by cohesive force. The people and the countries must be improved and civilized. This labor is possible only under communal and municipal institutions, and these are more or less preserved in European Turkey. The maximum of civil education, this corner-stone of society and of moral discipline, is obtained in local communities. These checkered countries will easily find each its own center and focus, from which light and amelioration will radiate more efficaciously than from a common Capital. Centralization may extend over them a spurious semblance of culture, but never reform them to the core, never generate a new, healthy life. These populations have been ground for centuries beneath the most degrading oppression; and first of all, the self-respect, the dignity of man is to be regenerated. Each of the countries and nationalities of European Turkey has its special characteristics. These can develop only under congenial conditions. Centralization would kill them, federation will foster and encourage them. In federation is their salvation and the promise of a better future. Their civilization is to evolve from within themselves, and not be superposed from without as a

cold, hard formula. Aspiration after mental and

physical culture is inborn in man. Now-s-days the

very atmosphere hourly evokes such aspirations in

every part of the world, especially throughout Christendom. (The militant Pro-Slavery men alone form an exception.) Even for the Christian pop-4lations of Turkey the time has gone b,g to receive the directions of civilization by order, from above. Give them liberty, and they will retrieve their manhood. Restore them to their normal conditions, give them solf-government, destroy forever the possibility of a regime of Fanariotes, and these populations-Greeks, Albanians, Bulgarians, and Slaves-will each in its own circle at once rush to work, and cultivate the rudiments of order and civilization. The various elements into which the Turkish Em-

pire must dissolve are already surrounded by cer-

tain bodies which will facilitate their crystallization. On the north are the Principalities and Serbia; west and south are Montenegro and Greece. These States, wholly or half independent, would prevent chaos from resulting upon the expulsion of the Turks, and facilitate the formation of new members of a confederacy. The Tschernogortsy, or inhabitants of the Black Mountain, who have been independent for nearly a century and a half, are called robbers and marauders by the Magyar liberals. But this small tribe of Serbs, singlehanded, reconquered its independence against fearful odds, and maintained it for a time nearly equal to that during which about half of the Magyars willingly recognized Turkish supremacy. Turkish Croatia and the Herzogovina may fuse and form a unit, or join Serbia and Montenegro. Bosnia, although inhabited by a Slavic race, is more than any other portion imbued with Mohammedanism, and the Bosniacs are generally unfriendly to their Christian countrymen. But their return to Christianity will be almost instantaneous as soon as the Ottoman rule disappears from Europe. Bulgaria is another Slavic unit. Roumelia is inhabited by Greeks and by Slave-Bulgarians. The Slavic region will fall naturally to Bulgaria; the Greek to Greece and to Constantinople. The Albanians present an ethnic and bistoric problem. They are hedged in between the Slavi and the Greeks, stretching their roots among the latter. The race is mixed; perhaps a remnant of ancient Epirots, perhaps a new combination of the various tribes and races which dwelt or roved in Roman times and until the dawn of the Middle Ages between the Adriatic, the Egean and the Black Seas and the Danube. Some philologists maintain that the basis of their language seems to indicate a closer affinity to the Latin than to the Greek. It may be a corruption of the remnants of various dialects once spoken there, or a new tongue framed by immigrants. The Albanians are not on good terms with the Serbs and other Slavi around them. About 200,000 Albanians are scattered over Greece and the Peloponnesus, whither they began to immigrate in the fifteenth century. In Albania Proper they may number about 1,300,-000 souls. All these reasons give to the hardy mountaineers of Albania the right to form an inde-

That part of Greece which is still groaning under the Turks will find its natural center in Athens and in the kingdom already constituted, or may form a State by itself. Above all these countries towers Constantinople with all its recollections of past grandeur and with all its indestructible Circean charms and seductions; its geographical position intensifies the halo surrounding its name.

Napoleon is reported to have said-although this saving is not very well substantiated—that the possessor of Constantinople was the master of Europe. Frederick the Great said something similar about France, and with far better logic. Fourier considers Constantinople as the future central phalanstere. Napoleon's dictum is not sustained by events. The activity, the conditions of European social, political, industrial, and commercial development are no longer concentrated about the Mediterranean. Besides, railroads, steamers, and telegraphs have reduced, almost to nothing, the strategic signification of Constantinople, and domination over Europe, from any point whatever, is now the dream of a lunatic. True it is, that the past seems to justify to a certain extent such speculations and predictions. The Byzantine Empire accomplished wonders during an existence of nearly a thousand years. But nine-tenths of these wonders are due to he circumstance that Constantinople was the focus f a most powerful centralization, commenced under the Roman Republic, and developed and perfected under the Emperors previous to Constantine. Under his successors Byzantium became a still better-perfected focus of centralization, which it continued to be after the division of the Roman world by Theodosius. It was by this marvelous centralization that the Eastern Emperors subdued the military anarchy which destroyed the West. Goths, Huns, Avars, Saracens, and Bulgarians, for a time victorious, were ultimately subdued. This central administrative organization arrested the first and fiercest onslaught of the Saracen force, before Charles Martel encountered in France one of its minor rills. The greedy Crusaders overpowered Byzantium as much by subterfuge as by bravery, and, dividing its rich spoils, struck the most deadly blow to the Empire. They impoverished the country, destroyed the centralization, and thus prepared the way for the Turks, who finally ate up the Eastern Empire piecemeal. This centralization subdued even the Church, and preserved an uninterrupted concatenation of Greco-Roman culture, transmiting it to Western Europe. But this could all have been obtained as well had any other spot become the focus of the centralization.

However, this same centralization, so powerful for external and defensive action, was the means by which poison was spread all through the orpanism. Centralization annihilated the political importance of local institutions, and palsied the life and growth of the populations at the roots. Then the Empire fell. Centralized governments, as was the Byzantine, are easily destroyed by a victorious enemy. Local independence engenders those patriotic feelings so often nipped in the bud, and frozen to the root by the soulless mechanism of centralization. Nevertheless, Constantinople remains a preeminent strategic position for the regions around the Black and the Egean Seas. While the Turks, however, during four centuries, awed Europe from Constantinople, other paramount conditions constituted their power. Those conditions have vanished. and the possession of the Straits and of the country on both sides of the Propontis, cannot save Turkey from crumbling in pieces. The possession of Constantinople would crush any small or large sovereignty; but the city, with a convenient circle of country, can be erected into a free and neutral harbor, similar to the German Hanseatic towns. As a member of a Greco-Slavic confederation it would lose its sting, and become a mart for the commercial intercourse of Asia and Europe. Such seems to be the normal, most healthy, and,

politically, the most practical transformation of the Turko-European inheritance. Then only can modern improvements, ways of communication, railroads, be introduced with security, or with hope of | that set forth by Jesus Christ. And, while I admit

success. To make all these improvements beneficial and productive, the countries upon which they are built must be the abode of industry. No people on earth surpasses the Bulgarians in laborious ness; but no industry, no agriculture can ever flourish under the putrid breath of the Turkomans.

The irresistable current of events, sweeping away the Moslems from Europe, may extend over Asia Minor, over regions which were for countless centuries the womb, the home of civilizations. Asia Minor was flourishing in many of her various independent portions before she became Persian Greek, Roman, or Byzantine. Crude attempts at federation resound from the Hellepo-Ionic past. The Tartar-Turkemans covered with desolation lands so sacred in the philosophical history of the human race. They completed the ruin of Asia. The day is dawning for renovation to succeed to death. The remains of the highly-endowed Semitic and Arian races have preserved the germs of a new life, like the seeds found in Egyptian sarcophagi. Europe is to give them a vitalizing impetus; not, however, by the application of antiquated formulas, but by putting them in condition to germinate, to unfold their innate characteristics, and to rise to genuine self-culture. GIIROWSKI.

MARRIAGE-DIVORCE.

To the Hon. ROBBET DALE OWEN of Indiana DEAR SIR: In my former letter, I asserted and

(I think) proved that I. The established, express, unequivocal dictionary meaning of Marriage is union for life. Whether any other sort of union of man and woman be or be not more rational, more beneficent, more meral, more Christian, than this, it is certain that this is Marriage, and that other is something else.

II. That this is what we who are legally married at all events, if married by the ministers of any Christian depomination-uniformly covenant to do I distinctly remember that my marriage covenant was "for better, for worse," and "until death do part." I presume yours was the same.

III. That Jesus of Nazareth, in opposition to the ideas and usages current in his time, alike among Jews and Gentiles, expressly declared Adultery to be the only valid reason for dissolving a Marriage. IV. That the nature and inhering reason of Marriage inexorably demand that it be indissoluble except for that one crime which destroys its essential condition. In other words, no marriage can be innocently dissolved; but the husband or wife may be released from the engagement upon proof of the utter and flagrant violation of its essential condition by the other party.

-And now, allow me to say that I do not see that your second letter successfully assails any of these positions. You do not, and cannot, deny that our standard dictionaries define Marriage as I do and deny the name to any temporary arrangement; you do not deny that I have truly stated Christ's doctrine on the subject (whereof the Christian ceremonial of Marriage, whether in the Catholic or Protestant Churches, is a standing evidence); and I am willing to let your criticism on Christ's statement pass without comment. So with regard to Moses: I am content to leave Moses's law of divorce to the brief but pungent commentary of Jesus, and his unquestionably correct averment that "from the beginning it was not so."

But you say that, if my position is sound, I make "a sweeping assertion" against the validity of the marriages now existing in Indiana and other divorcing States. O no, Sir! Nine-tenths of the people in those States-I trust ninety-nine hundredths-were married by Christian ministers, under the law of Christ. They solemnly covenanted to remain faithful until death, and they are fulfilling that promise. Your easy Divorce laws are nothing to them; their consciences and their lives have n part in those laws. Your State might decree that any couple may divorce themselves at pleasure, and still those who regard Jesus as their Divine Master and Teacher would hold fast to His Word, and live according to a "higher law" than that revised and relaxed by you.

I dissent entirely from your dictum that the words of Jesus relative to Marriage and Divorce may have been intended to have a local and temporary application. On the contrary, I believe he unlike Meses, promulgated the eternal and universal law, founded not in accommodation to special circumstances, but in the essential nature of God and Man. I admit that he may sometimes have withheld truth that he deemed His auditors unable to comprehend and accept, but I insist that what He did set forth was the absolute, unchanging fact. But I did not cite him to overbear reason by authority, but because you referred first to Christianity and the will of God, and because I believe what He said respecting Marriage to be the very truth. Can you seriously imagine that your personal exegesis on His words should outweigh the uniform tradition and practice of all Christendom?

You understand, I presume, that I hold to separations "from bed and board"-as the laws of this State allow them-only in cases where the party thus separated is in danger of bodily harm from the brutality of an insane, intemperate, or otherwise brutalized, infuriated husband or wife. I do not admit that even such peril can release one from the vow of continence which is the vital condition of marriage. It may possibly be that there is "temp-" tation" involved in the position of one thus legally separated, but I judge this evil far less than that which must result from the easy dissolution of mar-

-For here is the vital truth that your theory overlooks: The Divine end of Marriage is parentage or the perpetuation and increase of the Human Race. To this end, it is indispensable-at least, eminently desirable—that each child should erjoy protection, nurture, sustenance, at the hands of a mother not only but of a father also. In other words, the parents should be so attached, so de voted to each other, that they shall be practically separable but by death. Creatures of appetite, ools of temptation, lovers of change, as men are there is but one talisman potent to distinguish be ween genuine Affection and its meretricious counterfeit; and that is the solemn, searching question-Do you know this woman so thoroughly and love her so profoundly that you can assuredly promise that you will forsake all others and cleave to her only till death?" If you can, your union is one that God has hallowed, and Man may honor and approve; but, if not, wait till you can thus pledge yourself to some one irrevocably, invoking Heaven and earth to witness your truth. If you rush into a union with one whom you do not thus know and love, and who does not thus know and love you, yours is the crime, the shame; yours be the life-long penalty. I do not think, as men and women actually are, this law can be improved; when we reach the spirit world, I presume we shall find a Divine law adapted to its requirements, and

to our moral condition. Here I am satisfied with

that individual cases of hardship arise under this | of restrictions upon internal commerce the real road to law, I hold thee there is seldom an unhappy marriage that was not originally an unworthy onehasty and heedless if not positively vicious. And if people will transgress, God can scarcely save them from consequent suffering; and do not think you or I can.

HORACE GREELEY. New York, March 11, 1860.

To the Editor of The N. Y. Tribuna

SIR; Your paper of yesterday, 12th inst., contains letter bearing the signature of Robert Dale Owen. After eulogizing the doctrine of the New-Testament, which is carried out in the law of the State of New-York, and which only permits divorce in case of adultery, the writer falls foul of that "semi-barbarous" people, the Jews, and their legislator, Moses, whose law of divorce Mr. R. D. Owen professes to quot verbatim from Deuteronomy xxiv., i.: "When man bath taken a wife and married her, and it come to man hath taken a wife and married her, and it come to
pass that she find no favor in his eyes, then let him
write her a bill of divorcement and give it in her hand
and send her out of his house." Now, I would respecifully ask of Mr. R. D. Owen, how is it that, in
transcribing these words out of the Bible, he has left
out and altogether omitted the words "because he
hath found some uncleanness in her," which form an

out and altogether of matter the words between an hath found some uncleanness in her," which form an integral part of the first verse in the twenty-fourth chapter of Deuteronomy, after the sentence, "find no favor in his eyes," and before the sentence "then let him write," &c.

These words, omitted by Mr. R. D. Owen, form the gist of the whole law on divorce. For the Hebrew word ervah, which the English version here renders "uncleanness," is throughout Sacred Scripture invariably used to express illieit sexual intercourse. Vide Leviticus xviii, where the word occurs several times, and is rendered "nakedness."

Into the argument on divorce it is not my intention to enter; and as it is not parliamentary to impute motives, I must not say that Mr. R. D. Owen intentionally mutilated the text he quotes, leaving out words which fully prove that this Word of God, through Moses his servant, so cavalierly, not to say unfairly

which fully prove that this Word of God, through Moses his servant, so cavalierly, not to say unfairly treated by Mr. R. D. Owen, is identical with the law of our State which he praises as derived from the New Testament. But I should like to know, and I ask you, Mr. Ecitor, what degree of confidence and consideration can be due to the assertions and opinions of a disputant who, professing to quote verbatim from a book so well known as the Bible, "somehow" contrives to omit the pith and marrow of a law against which he directs his assault. directs his assault.

A SEMI-BARBAROUS RABBI.

FINANCIAL CRISES-THEIR CAUSES AND EFFECTS.

> MR. CAREY TO MR. BRYANT. LETTER ELEVENTH.

From The Evening Post, Tuesday, Feb. 28.

From The Evening Post, Tuesday, Feb. 26.

"An Example of the Effect of Protection.—
Among the commodities which have hitherto not been permitted to be brought into France from foreign countries is cutlery. It is now included in the list of merchandize to which the late treaty with Great Britain opens the ports of France.

"Those who have made a comparison of French cutlery with the cutlery of the British Islands must have been at first surprised at the difference in the quality. Nothing can exceed the perfection of workmanship in the articles turned out from the workshops of Sheffield. The symmetry and perfect adaptation of the form, the excellence of the material, the freedom from flaws, and the mitro-like polish which distinguish them, have for years past been the admiration of the world. French cutlery, placed by its side, has a ruder, rougher appearance, an unfinished look, as if the proper tools were wanting to the artisan, or as if it was the product of a race among whom the useful arts had made less progress.

"This is not owing to any parimony of nature, either in supplying the material to be wrought or the faculties of the artisan who brings it to a useful shape. The ores of the French mines yield metal of an excellent quality, and the French race is one of the most ingenious and dextrous in the world. In all manufactures requiring the nicest precision and the greatest delicacy of worlmanship the French may be said to excel the rest of man-kind. Out of the most unpromising and apparently intractable materials their skillful hands fabricate articles of use or ornament of the most pleasing and becoming forms. What, then, is the reason that their cutlery is so much inferior to that of Great Britain!

"In all probability the reason is that which at one time caused the atthe track to languish in Great Britain, which at one time

Britain?

"In all probability the reason is that which at one time cause the slik trade to languish in Great Britain, which at one time made the people of the same country complain that their glass was both bad in quality and high in price. In both these in "In all probability the reason is that which at one time caused the silk trade to languish in Great Britain, which at one time made the people of the same country complain that their glass was both bad in quality and high in price. In both these in stances the competition of foreign artisans was excluded; the British manufacturer having the monopoly of the market, there was nothing to atimulate his ingenuity: he produced articles or inferior quality, his vocation did not flourish, and both he and the community were dissatisfied. So with regard to the outlery of France, the difficulty has been the prohibition of the foreign article. Let the foreign and the Franch commodity be looked at side by side for a few years in the shop-windows of Paris, if the duty to which cutlery is still to be subject will permit it, and we think we may venture to pledge ourselves that the Franch workmen will show themselves in due time no way behind their English rivals. We may expect the same result to take place which has emuch actonished and puzzled the friends of protection in Sardinia, where the removal of prahlibitions and pretective duties has caused a hundred different branches of manufacturing industry to spring to sudden and prosperous activity."

DEAR SIR: Anxious that all the protectionists of the Union should, as far as possible, have it within their power to study both sides of this question, I here, as you see, lay before my readers your latest argument against protection, thereby affording them that opportunity of judging for themselves which you so systematically deny to the readers of *The Post*. Why is it that it is so denied? Is it that the British system can be maintained in no other manner than by such concealment of great facts as is here so clearly obvious? While enlarging upon the deficiences French cutlery, as resulting from protection, was it necessary to shut out from view the important that under a protective system, more complete, and more steadily maintained than any other in the world, France has made such extraordinary progress in all textile manufactures, that she now exports of them to the extent of almost hundreds of millions of dollars annually-sapplying them at home and abroad so cheaply, that she finds herself now ready to substitute protective duties for the prohibitions which have so long existed? Would it not be far more fair and honest were you to give your readers all the facts, instead of limiting yourself to the few that can be made to seem to furnish evidence of the truth of that system to which you are so much attached, and to which we are indebted for the financial crises whose ruinous effects you have so well described?

Why is it that the French people, while so successful with regard to silks and cottons, are so deficient in respect to the production and manufacture of the various metals? The cause of this is not, as you tell your readers, to be found in "the parsimony of nature, and yet, it is a well-known fact, that while the supply of coal and iron ore is very limited, others of the mo useful metals are not to be found in France. This however, is not all, the " parsimony of nature" which notwithstanding your denial of it, so certainly exists being here accompanied by restrictions on domest commerce of the most injurious kind, an account of which, from a work of the highest character, will be found in the following paragraph:

"By the French law, all minerals of every kind belong to the Orous, and the only advantage the proprietor of the soil enjoys, is, to have the refusal of the mine at the rent fixed upon it by the Crown surveyors. There is great difficulty sometimes in even obtaining the leave of the Orown to sinkin shaft upon the property of the individual who is anxious to undertake the speculation, and to pay the rent assally demanded, a certain portion of the gross product. The Courte Alexander de R.— has been valuity for upward of ten years."

Having read this, you cannot but be satisfied that it accounts most fully for French deficiencies in the mining and metallurgic arts. That such was the case, you knew at the time you wrote your article, or you did not know it. If you did, would it not have been far more fair and honest to have given all the facts? If you did not, is it not evident that you have need to study further, before undertaking to lecture upon questions of such high importance?

Turning now from French cutlery to British glass, find you telling your readers that the deficiency in this latter had been "in all probability" due to the fact, that " the competition of foreign artisans" had been a entirely excluded. On the contrary, my dear Sir, it was due to restrictions on internal commerce, gla having been, until within a few years past, subjected to an excise duty, yielding an annual revenue of m than \$3,000,000. To secure the collection of that rev enue, it had been found necessary to subject the manu facturer to such regulations in reference to his modes of operation as rendered improvement quite impossible From the moment that domestic commerce became free, domestic competition grew, bringing with it the great changes that have since occurred. That such is the case, is known to all the world, and yet I find no mention of these important facts in this article intended for the readers of The Post. Would they not, my dear Sir, be better instructed were you to permit them to see and read both sides of this great question ?

What has recently been done with British glas precisely what was sought to be done in France by Colbert and Turget, both of whom saw in the removal

an extended intercourse with other nations of the an extended intercourse with other nations of the world. With us, the great obstacle standing in the way of domestic commerce, is found in those large British capitals which, as we are now officially informed, constitute "the great instruments of warfare against the competing capitals of other countries, and are the most essential instruments now remaining by which the manufacturing supremacy" of England "carr be maintained;" and in protecting our people against that most destructive "warfare," we are but follow-ing in the direction indicated by the most eminent French economists, from Colbert to Chevalier, Fran has protected her people, and therefore is it, that agricultural products are high in price, while finished commodities are cheap, and that the country becomes more rich and independent from year to year. We refuse to grant protection, and therefore do we sink deeper in

Foreign competition in the domestic market is, how-ever, as we here are told, indispensable to improve-ment in the modes of manufacture. This being really so, how is it, my dear Sir, that France has so very much improved in the various branches, in which fo eign competition has been so entirely prokibited ! How is it that Belgium and Germany have so far superreded England in regard to woolen cloth.? How is it, that American newspapers have so much im-proved, while being cheapened? Have not these last an entire monopoly of the home market? Would it be possible to print a TRIBUNE, or a Post, in England, for New-York consumption? Perfectly protected, as you yourself are, is it not time that you should open your eyes to the fact that it is to the stimulation of do mestic competition for the purchase of raw materials, and for the sale of finished commodities, we must look for any and every increase in the wealth, happiness, and freedom of our people?

The more perfect the possession of the domestic market, the greater is the power to supply the foreign one -THE TRIBUNE being enabled to supply its distant subscribers so very cheaply, for the reason that it and its fellows have to fear no competition for home advertisements from The London Times, or Post. "This principle," as you yourself have most truly said,

principle," as you yourself have most true; and,
"Is common to every business. Every manufacturer practices
it, by always allowing the purchaser of large quantities of his
surplus manufacturer and advantage over the domestic consumer
for the simple reason that the domestic consumer must support
the manufacturer, and as the quantity of goods consumed at home
is very much larger than that sent abroad, it is the habit of the
manufacturer to send his surplus abroad, and sell at any price, as
as to relieve the market of a surplus which might depress prices
at home, and compel him to work at little or no profit."

Admitting now that it were possible for The Loadon Times to supply, on every evening, a paper precisely similar to yours—forcing abroad the surplus, and selling "at any price so as to relieve the domestic market," would you not be among the first to demand pro-tection against the system? Would you not assure tection against the system? your readers of the entire impossibility of maintaining competition against a journal, all of whose expenses of composition and editorship were paid by the home market-leaving its proprietors to look abroad for little more than the mere cost of paper and presswork? Would you not demonstrate to them the absolute necessity of protecting themselves against a " warfare" that must inevitably result in the creation of a " little oligarchy" of monopolists who, when domestic competition had been finally broken down, would compel them to pay ten cents for a journal neither larger nor better than they now obtain for two? Assuredly you would.

Addressing such arguments to your British free-trade friends, they would, however, refer you to the columns of The Post, begging you to study the assurance that had there been given, that-

"Whenever the course of financial fluctuation shall have broken the hold of monopolists and speculators upon theimines of iron and coal, which the almighty made for the common use of man, and whenever there shall be men of skill and enterprise te spare to go into the business of iron-making for a living, and not an expeculation, who shall set their wits at it to find out the best ways and the cheapest processes, it must be that such an abundance both of ore and fuel can be made to yield plenty of iron, in spite of the competition of European iron-masters who have to bring their products three thousand miles to find a market."

To all this you would of course reply, that "financial discretations" created monopolities and "market market make the statement of the

cial fluctuations" created monopolies, and "never broke their hold;" that men of "skill and enterprise" were not generally rich enough to compete with such rivals as The London Times; that domestic competition had already given us "cheaper ways and cheaper processes" than any other country in the world; that the freight of a sheet of paper was as nothing com-pared with the cost of editorship and composition; that all these latter costs were, in the case of the British journals, paid by the domestic market; that "the domestic consumers supported the British manufacturer: that the quantity of journals consumed at home was s very great that their producers could afford to sell abroad "at any price"—thereby "relieving the market of a surplus which might depress prices at home, that, for all these reasons, it was absolutely necessary to grant you such protection as would give you the same security in the domestic market as was then enjoved by your foreign rivals?

Would not all this be equally true if said to-day of

our producers of cloth and iron, coal and lead ? Does

the policy you advocate tend to place them in a position successfully to contend with those British manufactured who "voluntarily incur immense losses, in bad times, in order to destroy foreign competition, and to gain and keep possession of foreign markets?" Can they resist the action of the owners of those "great accum tions of capital" which have been made at our cost, and are now being used to "enable a few of the most wealthy capitalists to overwhelm all foreign competition in times of great depression"-thereby largely adding to their already enormous fortunes, "before foreign capital can again accumulate to such an extent as to be able to establish a competition in prices with any chance of success?" Can it be to the interest of any country to leave its miners and manufacturers exposed to a "warfare" such as is here officially declared? Do not they stand as much in need of protection, for the sake of the consumers, as you would do in the case supposed? Does not your own experience prove that the more perfect the security of the manucturer in the domestic market, the greater is the tendency to that increase of domestic competition which tends to increase the prices of raw materials, while lessening the cost of cloth and iron? Do not men, everywhere, become more free, as that competition grows, and as employments become more diversified Is not, then, the question we are discussing, one of the freedom and happiness of your fellow-men? If so, is it worthy of you to offer to your readers such arguments as are contained in the article above reprinted? Holding myself, as always heretofore, ready to give to my readers your replies to the questions I have put, I remain, my dear Sir,

Yours, very truly, HENRY C. CAREY. W. C. BRYANT, Esq. Philadelphia, March 13, 1960.

ORANGE COUNTY.

Correspondence of The N. Y. Tribune.

MONTGOMERY, ORANGE Co., March 14, 1860. The election of town officers yesterday returned Mr Rapelje as Supervisor by a majority of 132 in a total Napelje as Supervisor by a majority of 132 in a total vote of 644—his majority being 15 more than last year, though the vote is 25 less than that of last Spring. All the Republican candidates were elected (except the Collector), by majorities ranging from 51 to 163—average on all elected, 84.

P. S.—Charles Thompson (Dem.) is elected Supervisor of the town of Hamptonburgh by 52 majority. The remainder of the Democratic ticket has 99 maj.

DEATH OF WILLIAM BEACH.—The painful apprehension expressed in yesterday's Journal was realized but too soon. Mr. Beach expired, at 4 o'clock yesterday. Intelligence of this event will diffuse gloom among a wide circle here and at Auburn, of which city he was a most active and respected citizen. Generous, warm-hearled, energetic, and sagacious, his character was one both to elicit and to retain strong friendship. He represented the Cayuga and Wayne District with ability in the Senate from 1850 to 1854. This Winter he came to Albany, a few weeks since, and was stopping at the Delayan House when protrated by the illness which led so rapidly to a Satal termination. Mr. Beach was in the prime of life, and unmarried. His remains were taken to Anbarn today by his brother-in-law, Spetieer S. Benedics, eq., for interment. [Albany Evening Journal, 15th.] DEATH OF WILLIAM BEACH.—The painful appre